

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,109	KOLLARS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darren W. Ark	3643	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Response to Non-Final

 (1) Darren W. Ark.

(3) _____.

 (2) David Wolf.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 March 2005
Time: 10:30am EST
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)


Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
Rejections of the Office Action mailed 9/13/2004
Claims discussed:
1-8,14-16,19-21,25-28
Prior art documents discussed:
Prior art of record including WO 95/29584 to Schluter
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DARREN W. ARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated to applicant that claims 1, 7, and 25 defined over the prior art of record but claims 6 and 14 did not since WO 95/29584 discloses means for attracting having a composition (3, 11), a container for fluid (5), a control (12-14), and a trap (open end of 17 is capable of trapping an insect). Also Examiner indicated to applicant that claim 14 does not define over the WO 95/29584 patent since it is only functionally recited that the base and hood have surfaces for receiving an adhesive for trapping insects and that the adhesive is not positively recited as part of the desired invention. There are surfaces on the base (part of 2) and the (hood 7) capable of receiving adhesive. Examiner suggested amending claim 6 to replace the term "a trap" with the term "trapping means" to invoke 112, 6th paragraph to overcome the WO 95/29584 patent which only discloses a device for supplying carbon dioxide to ponds and aquaria and not for trapping or attracting insects or arthropods. Applicant agreed to the proposed changes to claims 6 and 14. Examiner also suggested amending claim 14 to recite the base as having a surface with an adhesive so as to overcome the WO 95/29584 patent in the same manner. Examiner also stated that in claim 5, the term "the adhesive" lacks positive antecedent basis. Applicant suggested amending claim 5 to replace "captured by the adhesive" with "using the trapping means". Examiner agreed. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.